

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 and 3-25 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14-16, 18, 20, 21 and 23-25 are amended, and claims 2 and 26-31 are canceled. Claims 23-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to non-elected inventions. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

With respect to the Restriction Requirement, Applicants respectfully submit that sub-combination claims 14, 18 and 20 correspond to combination claims 23, 24 and 25 respectively. Each respective combination claim (claims 23-25) recites each and every feature recited in sub-combination claims 14, 18 and 20, respectively. Thus, restriction between the presently pending combination and sub combination claims is improper. In addition, restriction between claims 1 and 13 is improper since claim 13 depends from and includes all features from claim 1.

Claims 1-12, 14-22 and 26-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. By this Amendment, each of the informalities noted with respect to the given claims has been addressed, for purposes of clarity only. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8, 26, 29 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Mirza. This rejection is moot in view of the Amendment to claim 1 which now includes the subject matter of claim 2, which indicated to be allowable in the Office Action. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Hutchinson. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 26-28.

Claims 27-29 and 31 were under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over either one of Mirza or Edwards et al. in view of Egloff et al. This rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 27-29 and 31.

Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 2-7 and 9-12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable. By this Amendment, the subject matter of claim 2 has been incorporated into claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 and its dependent claims are in condition for allowance.

Further, Applicants appreciate the indication that claims 14-22 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, which has been done. Since independent claims 14, 18 and 20 are indicated to be allowable, and because the same subject matter is recited in independent combination claims 23, 24, and 25, respectively, Applicants respectfully request that claims 23-25 also be included with the Notice of Allowability. Since claims 23-25 include the subject matter already deemed allowable by the Examiner, there is no additional burden involved in allowance of claims 23-25.

In regard to paragraph 13 of the Office Action, Applicants respectfully traverse the "Reasons for Allowance" since it is inconsistent with the claim language and does not identify the claim from which the language is allegedly quoted. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reformulate the reasons for allowance to be consistent with the claim language recited in the allowed claims.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that all the claims are allowable and that the entire Application is in condition for allowance. Should Examiner Luu believe that anything further is desirable to place

Smith et al.  
Appl. No. 09/584,751  
August 6, 2003

the application in better condition for allowance, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Paul T. Bowen  
Reg. No. 38,009

PTB:twg  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100